DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 131 747 HE 008 325

AUTHOR Nangle, John E.
TITLE A Study of Graduate Student Attitudes Regarding Graduate Education at Western Michigan University.
INSTITUTION Western Michigan Univ., Kalamazoo. Office of Institutional Research.
PUB DATE May 74
NOTE 78p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Environment; Demography; Facilities; Foreign Students; *Graduate Students; Graduate Surveys; *Higher Education; *Institutional Research; Internship Programs; Questionnaires; *School Surveys; Statistical Data; Student Attitudes; *Student Opinion; Student Reaction
IDENTIFIERS *Western Michigan University

ABSTRACT

The population from which the sample was systematically drawn was defined as those students enrolled in courses for graduate credit during the Winter 1973 semester, including 3,106 on-campus students, 1,051 taking courses off-campus, and 88 taking work both on- and off-campus. The questionnaire contained 10 sections: background and demographic information; satisfaction with academic program; adequacy of facilities and services; participation opportunities; admission and assessment; program changes; decisions to specialize; future plans; miscellaneous (thesis supervision, internship experiences, and problems of foreign students); and overall evaluation. A 75 percent questionnaire return rate was obtained. Some general conclusions were that: satisfaction is higher for those working toward a specific degree, for those at advanced degree levels, for full-time students, and for on-campus students. (LBH)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED131747

A STUDY OF GRADUATE STUDENT ATTITUDES REGARDING GRADUATE EDUCATION AT WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

by

John E. Nangle, Associate Director
Office of Institutional Research
Western Michigan University

May, 1974

HE 008 325

INTRODUCTION

In February of 1973 the Office of Institutional Research was called upon by The Graduate College to conduct a study which would provide pertinent information about our graduate student population. This request anticipated the creation of the All-University Committee on Graduate and Professional Education by President James W. Miller. While this report is a direct outgrowth of the need for data in this area, it also reflects the concern of these offices for a better understanding of the attitudes, perceptions, and feelings of the graduate students about their educational experiences while enrolled at Western Michigan University.

As a result of several meetings, The Graduate College and this office reached a joint agreement on the contents for the survey instrument to be sent to a sample of students enrolled during the Winter, 1973 semester. The questionnaire as developed contained ten sections, as follows:

Section 1. Background and demographic information
Section 2. Satisfaction with academic program
Section 3. Adequacy of facilities and services
Section 4. Participation opportunities
Section 5. Admissions and assessment
Section 6. Program changes
Section 7. Decisions to specialize
Section 8. Future plans
Section 9. Miscellaneous (thesis supervision, internship experiences, and problems of foreign students)
Section 10. Overall evaluation

PROCEDURES

The population from which the sample was systematically drawn was defined as those students currently enrolled in courses for graduate credit during the Winter, 1973 semester. This included 3,106 on-campus students; 1,051 taking courses off-campus; and 88 who were taking work both on and off campus. From

this population of 4,245, every second name was selected for inclusion. The original sample contained 2,121 names. The WMU Data Processing Department supplied a listing of the names, addresses, accumulated and current credit hours, entry dates, and curricula of the students. In addition, this office was provided with address labels and convelopes for mailing purposes.

In the process of mailing out the survey materials, 42 invalid addresses were found for which correct addresses were unavailable. There was, therefore, a presumed maximal respondent sample of 2,079 students. Of these, there were:

1,560 complete, usable returns
23 unusable returns
496 no response

The above results gave us the following return rates:

76.14% for returns of some sort
75.04% for usable returns

A personal letter dated March 9, 1973 from Dr. George Mallinson, Dean of The Graduate College, was sent to the students selected by the sampling procedures. They were informed of their selection and alerted to the fact that a questionnaire was soon to follow. This letter also indicated the purpose of the survey and solicited cooperation in the project. An initial mailing of questionnaires along with cover letters and self-addressed envelopes was sent out to potential respondents around March 12, 1973. About two weeks later a reminder in the form of a postal card was sent to those not yet having responded. On or about April 12, 1973 a follow-up letter and another copy of the questionnaire were sent to those in the sample who still had not responded. Copies of these materials may be found in Appendix A.

Upon receipt, the completed questionnaires were coded. In a number of instances, "open-ended" items were used. This necessitated content analysis before coding could be done. After coding, the questionnaires were sent to the WMU Computer Center where the analyses were performed and printouts provided of the results.

ANALYSIS

A number of separate analyses for student subgroups were possible, based upon some of the demographic data by which the sample had been characterized. For the purposes of this particular report, four basic categorizations appeared to be the most meaningful. These were:

1. Degree objective: Masters
   Specialist
   Doctorate
   Certification, etc. (PTC, "non-degree")

2. Total accumulated credit hours: Blank or zero
   1-9 hours
   10-30 hours
   31 or more hours

3. Current credits carried: No hours indicated
   1 to 8 hours, inclusive
   9 or more hours

4. Location: On-campus credits being earned
   Off-campus credits being earned

Results in the form of percentages of response are reported for the above analytic categories in Table No. 2. For a number of items, several discrete response categories were combined together or collapsed where the meaningfulness of response did not appear to suffer from such a procedure. In order to make response trends more readily apparent, the practice was often used to base percentages of response upon the number of persons actually responding to the item, rather than on the total number of students in the sample. The latter would normally include persons who failed to answer some survey questions.

Because of time pressures, the items unfortunately were not pretested for format or phraseology. Improvements are therefore lacking which would have sharpened the meaning of response alternatives and provided clarifications not otherwise possible.

RESULTS

Demographic Characteristics

Table No. 1 provides information on the background and personal characteristics of the sample. Where the data was available, population and sample statistics were compared for the purpose of establishing some indication of the representativeness of the respondent group. The data suggests that, in general, the sample was sufficiently similar to permit inferences about the original population. More specifically, distributions on degree objectives, residence, and off-campus enrollment were particularly obvious in their similarity. This table also shows the distribution of respondents by curriculum. It can be seen that the sample parallels the population in the proportional representation by colleges within the University.

Satisfaction with Academic Program

Generally, for all of the major student subgroup categories examined (degree objectives, accumulated hours, current hours, and location), the results suggested that the graduate students were most satisfied with the length of their program, the faculty, and the present grading system. On the other hand, these same students were least satisfied with the frequency with which courses were offered, the tuition rates, and the lack of opportunity to evaluate their courses. Except for doctoral students and those with 31 or more hours of accumulated credit, academic advising was something with which students were only moderately satisfied (overall, 67%).

Those students holding assistantships, and 137 replied that they did, were most satisfied with the amount of work required and with the relevance of the experience to their professional preparation. They were less satisfied with the size of the stipend and least satisfied with the availability of assistantships.

Relative to opinions about the departmental faculty as a whole, there was unanimity that they were both knowledgeable and helpful. They were, however, less favorably impressed with faculty teaching (39.1% rated this excellent) and even less so when it came to perceived level of productive accomplishments (63.3% rated this fair to poor).

In the area of quasi-professional activities, it was obvious that all groups were more likely to be encouraged to attend rather than participate in professional meetings of one sort or another. The former ranged from 35% up to 64% across major analytic categories.

As far as the type of preparation being sought by the students was concerned, when ranked by decreasing frequency of mention, teaching, application, teaching and research, and research appeared in that order. There was, however, considerable variation depending upon the subgroup involved. For instance, those specifically seeking advanced degrees were primarily preparing for an application role, whereas those taking course work for some other reason were primarily preparing only to teach. The full-time student was more likely preparing for an application role, while the part-timer was principally interested in teaching. Regarding the opportunity believed available for preparation in one's primary role, the data suggested some disparity between the kind of desired work role and the opportunity for preparation for that particular role. Agreement that opportunities were either excellent or good ranged from 65% to 78% for all types of preparation. Opportunities for preparation in teaching were seen as best; for a research role, the opportunities were viewed as being only fair to poor by 35% of those responding. For the sample, the following profile of expected work roles could be drawn:

Teaching only	- 39.1% (593)
Applications (admin., etc.)	- 38.7% (587)
Teaching & Research	- 20.1% (305)
Research only	- 2.0% (31)

Adequacy of Facilities and Services

Generally speaking, those services or facilities which were perceived as being most adequate by the largest number of students were library resources, assistance from The Graduate College, and the Computer Center data processing facility. Also, study facilities and the availability of laboratory and/or special purpose equipment were regarded as adequate. The students, however, were less than enthusiastic in their feelings about orientation for new students. Almost 62% felt this to be inadequate. They also believed that the availability of typing services was relatively poor as was the availability of course offerings during the spring or summer terms. Strictly speaking, of course, the latter does not represent a true facility or service. Off-campus housing and the availability of useful job information were viewed as less than adequate by many. Some variation did occur between analysis subgroups. For example, those working on specialist degrees were generally satisfied with the adequacy of special settings in which research could be conducted; however, master's students were far less likely to believe that this aspect was adequate (13% vs 32% answered "not adequate"). Conversely, specialist students were far less happy than master's or doctoral students about the adequacy of reference resource materials. As might be expected, fairly large differences of opinion were evident between on- and off-campus students regarding the adequacy of off-campus courses, housing, and the usefulness of certain facilities located only on campus.

Financial Aid

These results directly relate to the availability and use of loans as a form of aid, and are reported for the sample as a whole. It was found that 20% of the students had at one time or another applied for a loan. Just over 86% of these applications had been approved. By far the greatest proportion of

loans were National Defense Student Loans (41.5%), followed by Short-term Loans (30.7%) and Guaranteed Student Loans (17.6%). About 79% of those securing loans said that it was either very or fairly easy to obtain one. Almost three-fourths (72.2%) of the students found that the loan was adequate for their particular needs.

Participation in Activities

The data suggested rather consistently that many of the graduate students surveyed believe they have had ample opportunity to discuss their career plans with faculty members (from 50% to 81%, depending upon the subgroup to which they belonged). On balance, about 64% said that they had at least some opportunity for informal contacts with faculty. They believed that they had a reasonable opportunity to meet and/or to hear prominent people in their field. On the other hand, they were least likely to feel that sufficient opportunity existed for involvement in the governance of the University. Opportunities to participate in athletic and other recreational activities were viewed as limited, perhaps as the result of little free time.

Unfortunately, the responses to companion items dealing with what students would like to see in the way of opportunities were erroneously omitted from the computer input and hence there is presently no data to report here.

Admissions and Assessment

The initial six items in this section dealt with types of selection criteria that can be used depending upon the specific degree program involved. A fair degree of unanimity was evident in that most respondents in the sample (about 85%) believed personal interviews to be the most useful screening device. This was closely followed by undergraduate grades (less relevant for doctoral students, obviously), then by letters of reference. Because of their limited

applicability, the ATGSB and MAT were not seen as particularly useful by most students. Interestingly enough, the kind of data believed least useful by the largest number of students turned out to be the Graduate Record Examination. When students were categorized according to degree objectives and total accumulated hours, however, we found that doctoral students and those furthest along in some program were more likely to believe that the GRE was useful.

Opinions about the usefulness of the English Qualifying Examination were content analyzed. These results can be found in Table 3-A. It is noted that an essentially negative response was obtained from about 56% of the sample, while only 25% were explicitly positive in their attitude toward this test. About 19% of the graduate students expressed opinions which were essentially nonevaluative in nature.

When asked to rate on a comparative basis the admissions standards at Western to those used at other schools, the most likely response was that they were "higher than some." Overall, about 24% believed our standards to be lower than at other schools, and approximately 16% felt they were higher than at other institutions. Students were less likely to feel that our standards were lower than those at other colleges as the level of degree objectives increased (master's to specialist to doctoral), but they were more likely to feel this way as the total number of accumulated hours increased. The off-campus student is apparently more willing to believe that our admission standards are lower than is the case for the on-campus student.

When asked about their desire to see changes take place in Western's admissions standards, it was found that the majority of students (about 61% of them) would leave the standards as they are. However, about a third of the sample wanted to see them raised either somewhat or substantially. Only about 9% would like to see such standards lowered. Sentiment for greater rigor in

standards did increase with both the level of degree objective as well as increasing accumulated hours. The full-time students and the off-campus students were more likely to wish for a raising of standards than either part-time students or on-campus students.

Program Changes

Responses to this section were limited to those students who had made some significant change from one major field or discipline of study to another. The data on these shifts may be found in Table 3-B. Note that only 8.1% (127 out of 1,560 students in our sample) actually made such changes. Numbers of persons who changed from one major program into another are reported. This data is also summarized by college. Since the total number of students reporting such changes is relatively small, it is hazardous to conclude that these changes represent any general shifts that might be taking place. Table 3-C provides a listing of the reasons given for having changed from one major field of study to another. Shown at the bottom of this table is also a frequency distribution of the reported number of credit hours which had been accumulated before such a change was made. Only 14% of those changing fields indicated that they had experienced some difficulty in doing so. As one might anticipate, the most frequently given reason for changing was to optimize employment or career opportunities.

Decisions to Specialize

While not all graduate students specialize within a major field nor have all of those yet selected a specialty where one is appropriate, a sufficient number do make such a decision so that this becomes a potentially interesting area for exploration. Through a combination of rankings and response frequencies it was possible to determine what factors were primarily responsible for the

decisions to enter a given specialty area. The reasons, given in descending order of importance as derived from the data, were:

1. Aptitude and talents are in this area.
2. Greatest present employment opportunities.
3. Advised/counseled into this specialty.
4. Best long-range income potential.
5. Area offers security (i.e., future employment).
6. Directly relevant to job presently held.
7. Interests lie in this area.
8. Person likes and wants to do this.
9. Area was open and accepting students.

The remaining reasons for specializing in a certain area are listed in Table 3-D. Occasionally graduate students would change from one specialty to another within some major field of study. The data suggests that about 9% of the sample made such a change. An indication of the motivations prompting these changes is given in Table 3-E. As one might expect, the reasons given were generally of a very pragmatic sort.

Future Plans

There were 772 students who said that they definitely planned to pursue additional graduate work. If one adds to this number those who indicated that they would like to continue, but were uncertain whether they would or not, then approximately 53% of the sample expressed positive intentions or at least a desire to further their education beyond the immediate goal for which they were working.

Additional graduate work was being planned in the following areas by those who said that they were definitely going on:

Area	Percent
doctoral degree	43.4%
specialist degree	23.9%
another master's degree	20.1%
unspecified/non-degree	12.6%

For those students knowing where they wished to attend in order to pursue further graduate work, the largest percentage (61%) indicated that they planned to continue here at Western. Twenty-three percent intended to go out of state, while 16.2% said that they were planning on attending another institution in the State of Michigan.

When asked about the nature of their vocational goals, the sample of graduate students provided a total of 40 separate goals which became discernible through content analysis. These are listed in descending order based upon frequency of response and appear in Table 3-F. Only 2.2% of the sample were undecided about their vocational goals, while another 4.1% gave a number of mixed responses which could not be directly interpreted in terms of such goals. As might be anticipated, the relative proportions with which general occupational categories (e.g., teaching, business, public service, social service, etc.) were mentioned roughly paralleled the curricular areas represented by students in the sample.

For those students already holding jobs, it was found that about one-third of them planned to change jobs after receiving their degree, presumably because this would now qualify them for upgrading, promotion, or new careers to which they aspired. The reader is referred to Table 3-G for a listing of the general kinds of changes that were likely to be made. About 26% of such changes could specifically be regarded as upgrading or involved some form of job improvement. While this may have been implied in some of the other categories, it was not explicitly stated.

Capstone Experiences

When the degree of supervision given to those students preparing a project, thesis, or dissertation was examined, it was found that master's degree students felt they received either continuous, but not very close supervision,

or else they got very close and continuous supervision. Specialist and doctoral students were more likely to report receiving either very close, continuous supervision or neither very close nor continuous supervision. Students with fewer total accumulated hours were generally getting closer supervision, while those students further along in their programs were more likely receiving less supervision. An exception to this pattern were those graduate students having accumulated more than 30 hours. For them, supervision was close. This is probably indicative of the fact that many in this group were either doctoral students or were at an advanced stage where the only task remaining was the completion of a thesis or dissertation. The full-time graduate student appears to be getting closer supervision than does the part-time student. This observation appears reasonable. However, when we examined the on- versus off-campus students, a puzzling difference was found. Namely, the off-campus student more often reported receiving very close and continuous supervision while the on-campus student was more likely to say that he or she was receiving minimal supervision. This may be explanable on the basis that when the off-campus student comes onto campus, it is to obtain guidance on a project or research. On the other hand, on-campus students, by virtue of being here on probably an almost daily basis, are more likely to perceive the interaction with faculty as intermingled with a number of other activities in addition to the preparation of a research project. On balance, our sample of graduate students desired to receive rather close supervision on their major research effort. The data strongly suggests that the least preferred situation is one in which minimal help is obtained from the faculty member directing the thesis, dissertation, or project. The following proportions represent the relative number of students at each degree level who said that they were presently engaged in some phase of a research project, thesis, or dissertation:

Level	Percent Engaged in Research
Master	8.6%
Specialist	21.8%
Doctoral	37.5%
Other	3.2%

In all, 154 students, or 9.9% of the total sample, indicated that they were involved in this kind of activity at the time the survey was conducted.

As far as internships were concerned, a total of 86 students or 5.5% of the entire sample indicated that they had been or were presently involved in this form of educational experience. This group was asked to indicate its level of satisfaction with five dimensions of internships. The group proved to be most satisfied with the actual experience gained during the course of the internship. They were next most satisfied with the degree of relevancy of this experience to their general educational and career goals. These were followed by, in descending order of satisfaction, the length of the internship, the supervision received, and the advanced or preparatory planning which took place.

Foreign Students

An open-ended item was included in the questionnaire expressly for use by the foreign students at Western so that we might gain some information about the specific problem areas facing this group. The reader is referred to Table 3-H for an enumeration of the specific problem areas. Clearly, the three areas of greatest difficulty as perceived by this group of students were discrimination, language barriers, and finances. A total of 41 foreign students answered this particular item. It was perhaps encouraging that 25% of the comments indicated that no problems existed, this being the largest single category of response.

Overall Evaluation

A set of six questions was used in an attempt to solicit some fairly explicit reactions from the graduate students about WMU within an evaluative frame of reference. Table 3-I provides data on the reasons stated by them as to why they had originally selected Western in preference to some other school. These reasons were categorized through a content analysis, and are listed by descending frequency of mention. As with almost all of the open-ended type of items, any given respondent could have made several statements that subsequently would be coded into several distinct categories. Interestingly enough, the most frequent reason for choosing WMU (accounting for just over 48% of the total number of reasons given) was because of location and its related convenience. Sharply falling off in frequency of mention, but connected with the nature of our academic programs, were reasons associated with features such as some specific program of study, or the general quality or reputation of the school, its faculty, and programs. These accounted for another 26% of the comments made. Almost 11% indicated that their selection was at least partially based upon having been a student at Western prior to pursuing graduate work. Other reasons were associated with relatively pragmatic matters such as cost, acceptance into the graduate program, and the availability of courses at convenient times.

When asked to retrospectively assess the wisdom of their choice of WMU, 90% indicated that they were "pretty sure" or "definitely" sure that they had made the best decision. Only 10% said that they were "sure" or at least "pretty sure" that they had made a poor decision in coming to Western. This latter group was additionally asked why it held the opinion that it did; namely, that their choice of WMU had been poor. One hundred and fifty-one students in this group provided 164 statements which then were categorized into eight areas.

This enumeration appears in Table 3-J. By far the greatest proportion of reasons given stemmed from a dislike for some aspect of the academic program. In passing, one may note that, while a feature of the academic program was not the predominant reason why students originally were attracted here, it was the major reason why students later regretted having gone to WMU. Other, but relatively minor, reasons relate to faculty, fellow students, facilities, and the University as a whole.

While admittedly not often in a position to answer this question on truly objective grounds, the graduate students were nonetheless asked to give their opinions about Western's graduate program compared to that of other schools. The differences between major analysis subgroups appeared trivial. The general and predominant response pattern was that Western was better than some schools, accounting for 61% of the answers. This was followed by about 28% replying that WMU was better than most. Much smaller numbers of students indicated that Western was poorer than many (7.2%); that Western was the best (2.2%); or that it was one of the poorest (0.4%). On balance, the data suggested that the institution was perceived in a generally favorable light when being contrasted to other schools. Very few students, however, actually regarded WMU as either the best or the worst.

The final two items in the survey asked the students to review their experiences to date and to select out what they believed to be the best and least desirable features of the graduate program here at Western. The resulting statements were first content analyzed so that they could be assembled into fairly meaningful clusters. This data is summarized in Tables 3-K and 3-L. The response categories are listed in order of frequency of mention. While differences in the two lists are obviously present, it is also true that certain parallels existed. That is, the same factors or characteristics of

the school (e.g., courses, faculty, flexibility in planning and scheduling, meeting of educational needs) were mentioned by some students as the best feature while others mentioned the same area as the worst feature of the graduate program. Differential frequencies of mention tend to provide some indication as to the extent to which that particular aspect of the program triggered positive or negative reactions. For example, statements mentioning faculty as the best feature represented 17.3% of the total number of statements made, while this same factor was referred to in only 9.4% of the statements about the least desirable features in Western's graduate program.

SUMMARY OF TRENDS

While it is difficult to integrate the results of an omnibus questionnaire of the sort used in this study, it was possible to discern some apparent trends which probably warrant explicit mention.

With respect to the student subgroups used for analysis, the following generalizations are offered, although some exceptions clearly can be noted in the data:

1. Students who are not working toward a specific degree tend to have lower levels of satisfaction than those who are doing so.

2. Levels of satisfaction tend to increase as degree level advances. The doctoral student appears to be somewhat more positive in attitudes overall than does the master's student, for example.

3. As accumulative credit hours increase (i.e., the longer a student has been in graduate school), the level of satisfaction tends to also increase.

4. The full-time student generally tends to be the somewhat more satisfied person when compared to his part-time colleagues.

5. The on-campus student, in overall terms, manifested somewhat more positive attitudes about the University than did those studying off campus. For example, the latter as a rule were less satisfied in the areas of facilities and services, presumably because of a simple reduction in access to them.

SOME CONCLUSIONS

To the extent that the sample in fact represented the graduate student population at that point in time, certain conclusions may be drawn from the survey data.

1. While grades, interviews, and letters of reference were generally viewed as useful means for the assessment of applicants, test instruments such as the GRE, ATGSB, and MAT were more likely viewed as irrelevant. These devices perhaps are in need of evaluation from the standpoint of establishing their validity in the screening process.

2. Research as a career activity clearly seemed to be a minor key goal for the great majority of graduate students at Western, and likewise the faculty were perceived by them as not spending very much of their time in research. The University was not regarded as a research-oriented institution, even at the graduate level.

3. To the extent to which financial aid in the form of loans meets only a portion of one's total needs, the aid thus provided through the University appeared to be relatively adequate. However, students were dissatisfied with both the tuition costs and the limited availability of assistantships. Since these have an interrelated cost impact upon the student, steps should be considered which might contribute to increasing the actual number of assistantships awarded.

4. The English Qualifying Examination is one of those requirements which generally can be expected to elicit negative reactions from the students who must take it. Its purpose and content should be reviewed for possible modifications as to form, usage, and the time of administration.

5. A majority of our sample of current master's and specialist students indicated plans to continue their education (50.3% and 81.8%, respectively). The bulk of these individuals did not yet know where they would attend to pursue this additional work. Those who had made such a decision, however, said that they would remain at Western in a ratio roughly ranging from 2 or 3 to 1. We should examine the extent to which the University might wish to encourage those who are undecided to continue at Western.

6. Increasing the ways in which greater service could be extended to the off-campus graduate student clientele appears worthy of further exploration in view of their frequently lower satisfaction levels in the area of facilities and services.

7. Further changes to the grading procedures and practices do not seem especially warranted in view of the students' general level of satisfaction in this area. However, concerted attention apparently needs to be directed at both increasing the opportunity for graduate students to formally evaluate their courses, and in providing an appropriate orientation for new students to their departments and the University.

8. While part-time students taking graduate level courses for reasons other than obtaining an advanced degree cannot be characterized as alienated, the data does suggest that this group tends to be generally less satisfied than others with facets of the graduate program at Western. A closer examination of this particular group of students seems warranted in terms of identifying potentially unique sets of goals, needs, and circumstances that affect the adequacy and appropriateness of educational services being delivered to this particular group by the University.

TABLES

TABLE NO. 1	Demographic Characteristics
TABLE NO. 2	Response Percentages for Major Analysis Categories
TABLES 3-A through 3-L	Response Categories for Open-ended Survey Items

TABLE NO. 1

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Sample N	Sample %	Population N	Population %
Sex				
Male	758	48.59	1,856	58.1
Female	801	51.35	1,338	41.9
Ø	1	.06		
Degree Objectives				
Masters	1,240	79.5	2,448	76.6
Specialist	55	3.5	82	2.6
Doctorate	80	5.1	134	4.2
Certification	39			
None (specified)	52			
Other	23	11.9	530	16.6
Ø	71			
State of Residence				
Michigan	1,356	86.92	2,756	86.3
Other state	128	8.21	311	9.7
Outside U.S.A.	2	0.13	127	4.0
Ø	74	4.74		
Present Work thru Continuing Education				
Yes	392	25.13	1,139	26.3
No	1,103	70.71	3,194	73.7
Ø	65	4.17		
Enrollment Status				
No hours indicated	11	0.71		
01-08 hours	1,124	72.05	2,156	67.5
09 or more hours	399	25.58	1,038	32.5
Ø	26	1.67		
Curricular Distribution				
College of Applied Sciences				
Home Economics (HEG)	6	9.5*	13	10.7
Occupational Therapy (MOT)	10	15.9	20	16.4
Operations Research (ORG)	1	1.6	1	0.8
Paper Science & Engineering (PSE)	2	3.2	8	6.6
Technology (TEC)	21	33.3	38	31.1
Teaching of Distributive Ed. (TDE)	2	3.2	3	2.5
Teaching of Home Economics (THE)	4	6.3	7	5.7
Teaching of Industrial Ed. (TIE)	17	27.0	32	26.2
College Total	63	4.0	122	3.8

* Percentages represent the proportion of students in a curriculum within the college. The College Total is the proportion of the sample found in each college.

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS
(Cont'd)

	Sample		Population	
	N	%	N	%
Curricular Distribution (cont'd)				
College of Arts & Sciences-Humanities				
Communication Arts & Sciences (CAS)	31	37.4	62	34.4
English (ENG)	16	19.3	32	17.8
Languages (LAN)	9	10.8	23	12.8
Speech Pathology (SPG)	23	27.7	54	30.0
Teaching of English (TOE)	4	4.8	9	5.0
Division Total	83	5.3	180	5.6
College of Arts & Sciences-Science				
Biology (BIO)	34	14.7	58	12.8
Chemistry (CHM)	15	6.5	32	7.1
Computer Science (CSC)	1	0.4	8	1.8
Earth Science (ESC)	4	1.7	6	1.3
Geography (GEO)	9	3.9	20	4.4
Geology (GLG)	3	1.3	11	2.4
Mathematics (MTH)	13	5.6	32	7.0
Physics (PHY)	6	2.6	14	3.1
Psychology (PSY)	88	37.9	180	39.6
School Psychology (SPY)	10	4.3	20	4.4
Science Education (SCD)	26	11.2	25	5.5
Statistics (STA)	3	1.3	5	1.1
Teaching of Mathematics (TMA)	3	1.3	11	2.4
Teaching of Science (TSI)	17	7.3	32	7.1
Division Total	232	14.9	454	14.2
College of Arts & Sciences-Social Science				
Anthropology (ANG)	10	6.1	27	7.9
Economics (ECN)	15	9.1	33	9.6
History (HST)	19	11.6	44	12.8
International & Area Studies (IAS)	14	8.5	33	9.6
Medieval Studies (MMS)	5	3.1	9	2.6
Political Science (PSC)	19	11.6	31	9.0
Social Work (MSW)	40	24.4	96	27.9
Sociology (SOC)	30	18.3	60	17.4
Teaching of Social Science (TSS)	12	7.3	11	3.2
Division Total	164	10.5	344	10.8
College of Business				
Accountancy (ACT)	10	7.5	14	5.0
Business Administration (MBA)	94	70.1	204	72.9
Teaching Business Education (TBE)	30	22.4	62	22.1
College Total	134	8.6	280	8.8

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS
(Cont'd)

	Sample		Population	
	N	%	N	%
Curricular Distribution (cont'd)				
College of Education				
Audio-Visual Media (AVM)	22	3.4	50	4.8
Blind Rehabilitation (HTB, OMS)	23	3.5	45	4.3
Counseling-Personnel (C-P)	156	24.0	315	30.2
Educational Leadership (ED)	108	16.6	167	16.0
Special Education (SPE)	51	7.9	76	7.3
Teaching in Community College (TCC)	27	4.2	75	7.2
Teaching the Culturally Deprived (TCD)	14	2.2	25	2.4
Teaching in Elementary School (TEL)	115	17.7	104	10.0
Teaching in Junior High (TJH)	12	1.8	13	1.3
Teaching Physical Education (TPE)	20	3.1	41	3.9
Teaching of Reading (TRE)	101	15.6	131	12.6
College Total	649	41.6	1,042	32.7
College of Fine Arts				
Art (ARG, MFA)	9	23.7	22	29.3
Music (MUG)	14	36.8	29	38.7
Teaching of Art (TAT)	5	13.2	8	10.7
Teaching of Music (TMU)	10	26.3	16	21.3
College Total	38	2.4	75	2.4
The Graduate College				
Librarianship (LIG)	104	6.7	169	5.3
Other				
Non-Degree (ND)	74	79.5	392	74.8
Permission to Take Classes (PTC)	17	18.3	108	20.6
Guest Matriculant (GM)	1	1.1	21	4.0
Professional Improvement Program (PIP)	1	1.1	3	0.6
Other Total	93	6.0	524	16.4
Age				
20-24	433	27.76		
25-29	571	36.60		
30-34	233	14.94		
35-39	119	7.63		
40-44	76	4.87		
45-49	53	3.40		
50-54	25	1.60		
55 or over	14	0.90		
Ø	36	2.31		

DEOMGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS
(Cont'd)

	Sample N	Sample %
Marital Status		
Single	391	25.06
Married	867	55.58
Other	298	19.10
Ø	4	0.26
Race		
Black	49	3.14
American Indian	1	0.06
Oriental	16	1.03
Spanish	6	0.38
White	973	62.37
Other	3	0.19
Ø	512	32.82
Employment Status		
Employed	1,169	74.94
Not employed	368	23.59
Other	5	0.32
Ø	18	1.15
Holding Assistantship		
Yes	137	8.78
No	1,119	71.73
Ø	304	19.49
Holding Fellowship		
Yes	95	6.09
No	1,387	88.91
Ø	78	5.00
Previous Degree		
Bachelors	1,313	84.17
Masters	205	13.14
Specialist	3	0.19
Doctorate	1	0.06
Other	3	0.19
Ø	35	2.24
Internship	86	5.50
Thesis/Dissertation	154	9.90

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS
(Cont'd)

	Sample N	Sample %
Credits Accumulated Off Campus		
1-6	284	18.21
7-12	146	9.36
13-18	66	4.23
19-24	27	1.73
25-35	8	0.51
36-50	1	0.06
51 or more	2	0.13
None (specified)	399	25.58
Other schools	3	0.19
Ø	624	40.00
Accumulated Hours to Date		
None	262	16.80
2-15 hours	691	44.29
16-30	380	24.36
31-60	177	11.35
61 hours or more	34	2.18
Ø	16	1.03

TABLE NO. 2
RESPONSE PERCENTAGES FOR MAJOR ANALYSIS CATEGORIES

		DEGREE OBJECTIVE				ACCUM. CREDIT HOURS				CURRENT CREDIT HOURS			PROGRAM LOCATION	
		M.A.	Spec.	Ph.D.	Non Degree	Blank or 0	1-9	10-30	30+	Blank or 0	1-8	9 or more	On Campus	Off Campus
SECTION 2. Satisfaction with Academic Program														
The advising I receive about my academic program	(1)	69	74	82	58	61	65	70	80	41	69	69	63	69
	(2)	27	24	17	14	25	24	27	18	53	23	28	21	27
	(3)	4	2	1	28	14	11	3	2	6	8	3	16	4
The frequency with which courses I need are offered	(1)	59	62	69	59	53	56	62	67	53	58	65	61	59
	(2)	39	36	30	29	39	41	36	31	44	38	33	32	39
	(3)	2	2	1	12	8	3	2	2	3	4	2	7	2
The overall content of my program	(1)	77	80	77	62	75	75	75	79	57	76	76	75	75
	(2)	21	18	23	16	17	19	24	19	43	19	23	14	24
	(3)	2	2	0	22	8	6	1	2	0	5	1	11	1
The "core" requirements in my program	(1)	66	74	70	53	66	66	63	70	43	65	68	58	68
	(2)	30	24	29	16	23	25	33	27	49	27	29	27	28
	(3)	4	2	1	31	11	9	4	3	8	8	3	15	4
The sequence of courses in my program	(1)	73	76	74	55	62	69	73	79	48	72	68	70	70
	(2)	18	17	18	11	18	15	19	14	46	14	22	11	19
	(3)	9	7	8	34	20	16	8	7	6	13	10	19	11
The instructional faculty	(1)	82	76	80	82	85	81	78	81	77	81	79	82	79
	(2)	18	22	19	18	13	19	22	19	23	18	21	16	21
	(3)	0	2	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0
Grading procedures, policies, and practices	(1)	81	80	74	77	83	80	80	78	69	82	77	85	78
	(2)	18	18	25	21	14	19	20	21	31	17	22	14	21
	(3)	1	2	1	2	3	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1

(1) = very & fairly satisfied

(2) = not especially satisfied & very dissatisfied

(3) = doesn't pertain to me

RESPONSE PERCENTAGES FOR MAJOR ANALYSIS CATEGORIES (Cont'd)

		DEGREE OBJECTIVE				ACCUM. CREDIT HOURS				CURRENT CREDIT HOURS			PROGRAM LOCATION	
		M.A.	Spec.	Ph.D.	Non Degree	Blank or 0	1-9	10-30	30+	Blank or 0	1-8	9 or more	On Campus	Off Campus
The length of my program in credit hours	(1)	89	82	87	68	82	84	89	88	71	86	87	84	86
	(2)	10	16	12	7	9	10	10	10	26	9	12	8	12
	(3)	1	2	1	25	9	6	1	2	3	5	1	8	2
The flexibility I have in planning my own program of study	(1)	69	82	80	58	65	67	69	76	41	69	70	65	70
	(2)	28	16	20	23	25	28	28	22	56	26	26	25	27
	(3)	3	2	0	19	10	5	3	2	3	5	4	10	3
The opportunity to formally evaluate the courses I take	(1)	53	67	53	49	48	55	53	59	38	53	57	52	55
	(2)	41	29	43	38	33	40	44	36	59	40	38	39	39
	(3)	6	4	4	13	19	5	3	5	3	7	5	9	6
The tuition rate	(1)	54	48	63	52	47	53	54	64	51	54	52	49	55
	(2)	43	37	33	47	50	44	41	33	46	43	41	47	41
	(3)	3	15	4	1	3	3	5	3	3	3	7	4	4
The size of the stipend (pay) for assistantship*	(1)	60	45	62	100	65	56	61	63	75	57	63	62	59
	(2)	40	55	38	0	35	44	39	37	25	43	37	38	41
The amount of work I am required to perform in the assistantship*	(1)	79	71	90	71	82	77	77	87	44	77	86	71	80
	(2)	21	29	10	29	18	23	23	13	56	23	14	29	20
Availability of an assistantship*	(1)	39	50	62	31	39	35	40	52	27	38	45	18	42
	(2)	61	50	38	69	61	65	60	48	73	62	55	82	58
Relevancy of assistantship to my professional preparation*	(1)	77	80	82	100	78	76	77	82	80	77	79	89	79
	(2)	23	20	18	0	22	24	23	18	20	23	21	11	21

* Percentages based upon only those students who checked alternatives 1 through 4.

(1) = very & fairly satisfied

(2) = not especially satisfied & very dissatisfied

(3) = doesn't pertain to me

RESPONSE PERCENTAGES FOR MAJOR ANALYSIS CATEGORIES (Cont'd)

		DEGREE OBJECTIVE				ACCUM. CREDIT HOURS				CURRENT CREDIT HOURS			PROGRAM LOCATION	
		M.A.	Spec.	Ph.D.	Non Degree	Blank or 0	1-9	10-30	30+	Blank or 0	1-8	9 or more	On Campus	Off Campus
Based upon your experience thus far, how would you rate your department's faculty with respect to the following:														
Knowledge of their field	(1)	79	66	70	76	77	78	79	76	69	77	82	78	77
	(2)	21	34	30	24	23	22	21	24	31	23	17	22	23
	(3)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Teaching ability	(1)	40	30	27	42	46	40	36	37	23	41	37	47	36
	(2)	53	59	69	51	47	55	54	58	65	53	54	49	54
	(3)	7	11	4	7	7	5	10	5	12	6	9	4	10
Productivity (publishing, creative works, etc.)	(1)	37	31	35	38	40	38	33	40	34	36	39	41	36
	(2)	54	61	57	57	52	57	56	51	52	56	51	56	53
	(3)	9	8	8	5	8	5	11	9	14	8	10	3	11
Research skills	(1)	47	33	48	48	49	46	45	48	34	47	47	51	45
	(2)	48	63	47	50	48	52	48	47	59	49	47	47	49
	(3)	5	4	5	2	3	2	7	5	7	4	6	2	6
Helpfulness to students	(1)	58	58	60	51	62	53	58	60	44	57	62	58	57
	(2)	37	36	35	42	34	41	37	36	41	38	33	38	37
	(3)	5	6	5	7	4	6	5	4	15	5	5	4	6

32

(1) = excellent (2) = fair (3) = poor

RESPONSE PERCENTAGES FOR MAJOR ANALYSIS CATEGORIES (Cont'd)

		DEGREE OBJECTIVE				ACCUM. CREDIT HOURS				CURRENT CREDIT HOURS			PROGRAM LOCATION	
		M.A.	Spec.	Ph.D.	Non Degree	Blank or 0	1-9	10-30	30+	Blank or 0	1-8	9 or more	On Campus	Off Campus
How much encouragement have you received from faculty members														
To attend professional meetings	(1)	43	61	64	43	40	37	46	63	35	40	58	37	48
	(2)	44	31	31	28	37	43	45	32	47	43	36	38	42
	(3)	13	8	5	29	23	20	9	5	18	17	6	25	10
To present papers, perform, exhibit, etc.	(1)	28	42	32	26	32	28	26	32	27	25	38	27	30
	(2)	50	43	58	35	38	42	55	54	50	48	50	39	51
	(3)	22	15	10	39	30	30	19	14	23	27	12	34	19

(1) = great deal or moderate encouragement (2) = small amount or no encouragement (3) = doesn't pertain to me

What area most nearly represents the kind of preparation you are seeking? Indicate the extent to which you believe your program provides opportunities for that type of professional preparation.

Teaching only		37	21	6	63	41	44	38	19	37	44	21	58	27
Opportunites for preparation	(1)	79	57	50	78	82	77	76	76	64	79	71	80	74
	(2)	17	29	17	16	11	19	19	16	22	17	18	16	19
	(3)	5	14	33	6	7	4	5	8	14	4	11	4	7
Research only		3	0	0	0	2	1	2	1	0	1	4	0	3
Opportunities for preparation	(1)	65	50	0	75	55	65	71	64	100	68	60	58	68
	(2)	27	50	0	25	45	29	18	18	0	24	32	33	25
	(3)	8	0	100	0	0	6	11	18	0	8	8	9	7

(1) = excellent or good (2) = fair (3) = poor

27

RESPONSE PERCENTAGES FOR MAJOR ANALYSIS CATEGORIES (Cont'd)

		DEGREE OBJECTIVE				ACCUM. CREDIT HOURS				CURRENT CREDIT HOURS			PROGRAM LOCATION	
		M.A.	Spec.	Ph.D.	Non Degree	Blank or 0	1-9	10-30	30+	Blank or 0	1-8	9 or more	On Campus	Off Campus
Teaching and research		20	29	36	10	20	18	19	22	26	17	27	9	25
Opportunites for preparation	(1)	70	83	83	74	76	77	68	73	60	72	73	78	70
	(2)	25	17	10	22	20	20	26	23	30	24	21	22	25
	(3)	5	0	7	4	4	3	6	4	10	4	6	0	5
Applications (administration, etc.)		38	50	61	24	33	32	38	56	29	35	45	27	42
Opportunites for preparation	(1)	69	79	80	66	76	66	68	76	33	70	74	75	68
	(2)	24	14	14	26	19	28	22	21	50	22	21	19	24
	(3)	7	7	6	8	5	6	10	3	17	8	5	6	8

(1) = excellent or good (2) = fair (3) = poor

SECTION 3. Adequacy of Facilities and Services

Cooperation and assistance of The Graduate College Office*	(1)	34	49	41	40	37	34	35	41	28	35	37	37	35
	(2)	54	41	53	52	50	57	53	53	44	54	53	55	54
	(3)	12	10	6	8	13	9	12	6	28	11	10	8	11
Availability of courses in the Spring and Summer terms*	(1)	11	10	12	13	10	9	13	14	9	12	12	15	10
	(2)	46	51	52	56	45	46	47	53	47	48	44	51	44
	(3)	43	39	36	31	45	45	40	33	44	40	44	34	46
Availability of courses I need in the evenings or on Saturday*	(1)	22	31	26	21	21	18	24	28	30	19	31	16	25
	(2)	45	48	45	51	42	47	45	47	37	45	48	53	42
	(3)	33	21	29	28	37	35	31	25	33	36	21	31	33

* Percentages based upon only those students who checked alternatives 1 through 3.

(1) = very adequate (2) = fairly adequate (3) = not adequate

RESPONSE PERCENTAGES FOR MAJOR ANALYSIS CATEGORIES (Cont'd)

		DEGREE OBJECTIVE				ACCUM. CREDIT HOURS				CURRENT CREDIT HOURS			PROGRAM LOCATION	
		M.A.	Spec.	Ph.D.	Non Degree	Blank or 0	1-9	10-30	30+	Blank or 0	1-8	9 or more	On Campus	Off Campus
Opportunity to complete some portion of my grad program through off-campus courses*	(1)	24	23	27	36	21	30	25	26	9	25	32	35	18
	(2)	38	37	47	42	40	37	39	46	46	41	32	43	34
	(3)	38	40	26	22	39	33	36	28	45	34	36	22	48
Availability of useful job information in my field from the Career Planning and Placement Office*	(1)	19	37	18	26	17	21	20	25	14	21	19	24	18
	(2)	45	22	39	45	51	42	45	37	32	47	39	54	42
	(3)	36	41	43	29	32	37	35	38	54	32	42	22	40
My department as a source of useful job information*	(1)	24	24	15	15	24	17	23	29	12	20	29	17	24
	(2)	44	42	53	53	48	47	43	48	44	48	42	56	43
	(3)	32	34	32	32	8	36	34	23	44	32	29	27	33
Availability of off-campus housing facilities*	(1)	29	39	31	17	28	31	28	27	17	28	29	25	28
	(2)	49	56	40	55	49	44	49	57	67	51	47	39	50
	(3)	22	5	29	28	23	25	23	16	16	21	24	36	22
Access to study facilities (quite study space such as carrels)*	(1)	41	35	41	46	35	45	42	42	32	45	35	43	41
	(2)	42	46	43	39	47	39	42	39	44	43	40	45	40
	(3)	17	19	16	15	18	16	16	19	24	12	25	12	19
Availability to typing services when needed*	(1)	19	24	20	24	21	23	18	17	15	22	16	31	19
	(2)	34	41	41	24	32	34	32	43	31	33	35	32	33
	(3)	47	35	39	52	47	43	50	40	54	45	49	37	48
Availability of duplication services when needed*	(1)	32	38	25	30	30	33	32	33	28	33	32	34	32
	(2)	46	34	46	48	46	49	44	44	52	44	47	45	45
	(3)	22	28	29	22	24	18	24	23	20	23	21	21	23

* Percentages based upon only those students who checked alternatives 1 through 3.

(1) = very adequate (2) = fairly adequate (3) = not adequate

		DEGREE OBJECTIVE				ACCUM. CREDIT HOURS				CURRENT CREDIT HOURS			PROGRAM LOCATION	
		M.A.	Spec.	Ph.D.	Non Degree	Blank or 0	1-9	10-30	30+	Blank or 0	1-8	9 or more	On Campus	Off Campus
Literature and reference resources (e.g. Waldo Library, ERC, etc.)*	(1)	46	37	44	47	46	47	45	47	37	49	40	51	44
	(2)	43	41	46	47	44	44	44	43	50	44	43	45	43
	(3)	11	22	10	6	10	9	11	10	13	7	17	4	13
Availability of research facilities:*														
Laboratory space	(1)	29	26	38	35	21	31	30	35	8	30	32	34	28
	(2)	51	56	50	51	59	53	50	46	69	53	45	57	51
	(3)	20	18	12	14	20	16	20	19	23	17	23	9	21
Specialized equipment	(1)	28	25	31	23	19	25	29	34	17	25	33	26	26
	(2)	52	54	58	63	59	55	51	53	61	58	45	68	52
	(3)	20	21	11	14	22	20	20	13	22	17	22	6	22
Computer/EDP capabilities	(1)	40	40	55	38	37	37	45	42	18	41	43	40	41
	(2)	47	45	41	50	46	52	43	48	46	46	47	47	47
	(3)	13	15	4	12	17	11	12	10	36	13	10	13	12
Special settings in which research can be conducted	(1)	21	30	27	18	16	20	22	28	14	23	21	24	21
	(2)	47	57	58	58	41	51	51	51	36	51	48	54	48
	(3)	32	13	15	24	43	29	27	21	50	26	31	22	31
The orientation of new graduate students to the University and their departments*	(1)	8	22	13	3	9	8	7	10	14	6	13	5	9
	(2)	29	25	42	31	32	26	30	36	18	29	34	32	30
	(3)	63	53	45	66	59	66	63	54	68	65	53	63	61

* Percentages based upon only those students who checked alternatives 1 through 3.

(1) = very adequate (2) = fairly adequate (3) = not adequate

RESPONSE PERCENTAGES FOR MAJOR ANALYSIS CATEGORIES (Cont'd)

		DEGREE OBJECTIVE				ACCUM. CREDIT HOURS				CURRENT CREDIT HOURS			PROGRAM LOCATION	
		M.A.	Spec.	Ph.D.	Non Degree	Blank or 0	1-9	10-30	30+	Blank or 0	1-8	9 or more	On Campus	Off Campus
Have you ever applied for a loan through the University?	(Yes)	21	24	19	13	18	18	20	27	17	16	31	10	25
	(No)	79	75	81	87	82	82	80	73	80	84	69	90	75
If yes, was it approved?	(Yes)	85	85	80	77	88	82	82	91	86	83	87	76	86
	(No)	15	15	20	23	12	18	18	9	14	17	13	24	14
What type of loan?														
National Defense Student Loan		42	43	50	42	43	47	40	39	33	41	43	44	42
Short-term loan		31	36	19	29	29	31	30	33	67	31	28	26	31
Tuition Payment Plan		1	7	0	0	2	0	2	2	0	2	1	3	1
Guaranteed Student Loan		18	14	19	13	16	14	20	17	0	18	19	12	20
College Aid Plan		0	0	0	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	0
Other		4	0	6	4	4	4	3	7	0	4	5	3	3
Don't know		4	0	6	8	6	4	4	2	0	4	4	9	3
In applying for a loan, how easy was it to secure one?	(1)	89	83	92	100	89	91	88	94	100	91	87	96	89
	(2)	11	17	8	0	11	9	12	6	0	9	13	4	11

(1) = very or fairly easy

(2) = fairly or very difficult

RESPONSE PERCENTAGES FOR MAJOR ANALYSIS CATEGORIES (Cont'd)

		DEGREE OBJECTIVE				ACCUM. CREDIT HOURS				CURRENT CREDIT HOURS			PROGRAM LOCATION	
		M.A.	Spec.	Ph.D.	Non Degree	Blank or 0	1-9	10-30	30+	Blank or 0	1-8	9 or more	On Campus	Off Campus
Please describe the extent to which a loan met your financial needs	(1)	81	100	100	95	84	83	79	96	83	88	79	93	83
	(2)	19	0	0	5	16	17	21	4	17	12	21	7	17

(1) = very or fairly adequately (2) = not too or not at all adequately

SECTION 4. Participation

Indicate the degree to which you believe opportunities have been available.

Graduate student participation in departmental governance	(1)	45	53	59	45	45	41	46	55	37	45	49	43	46
	(2)	55	47	41	55	55	59	54	45	63	55	51	57	54
Graduate student participation in some aspects of governance at the University level	(1)	34	38	39	44	38	33	34	39	52	37	30	35	34
	(2)	66	62	61	56	62	67	66	61	48	63	70	65	66
Participation in social activities for graduate students	(1)	44	49	46	40	44	43	42	49	37	43	45	41	45
	(2)	56	51	54	60	56	57	58	51	63	57	55	59	55
Participation in athletic or other recreational activities	(1)	41	44	40	45	38	40	42	43	35	40	44	35	43
	(2)	59	56	60	55	62	60	58	57	65	60	56	65	57
Informal contacts with the faculty members in my department	(1)	63	71	69	61	62	65	61	69	45	60	75	55	67
	(2)	37	29	31	39	38	35	39	31	55	40	25	45	33

(1) = great or some present opportunity (2) = little or no present opportunity

RESPONSE PERCENTAGES FOR MAJOR ANALYSIS CATEGORIES (Cont'd)

		DEGREE OBJECTIVE				ACCUM. CREDIT HOURS				CURRENT CREDIT HOURS			PROGRAM LOCATION	
		M.A.	Spec.	Ph.D.	Non Degree	Blank or 0	1-9	10-30	30+	Blank or 0	1-8	9 or more	On Campus	Off Campus
Discussions about my career plans with faculty members	(1)	64	76	81	53	64	58	65	76	50	61	74	54	70
	(2)	36	24	19	47	36	42	35	24	50	39	26	46	30
Chances to hear and meet guest lecturers or visitors who are prominent in my field	(1)	58	56	64	52	54	56	58	63	39	53	69	42	64
	(2)	42	44	36	48	46	44	42	37	61	47	31	58	36

(1) = great or some present opportunity (2) = little or no present opportunity

SECTION 5. Admissions and Assessment

What is your opinion about the usefulness of each of the following in screening applicants?

Undergraduate grades	(1)	85	86	79	74	83	82	86	78	82	82	86	79	85
	(2)	12	14	17	17	13	13	12	18	15	14	11	15	12
	(3)	3	0	4	9	4	5	2	4	3	4	3	6	3
Graduate Record Exam (aptitude portion)	(1)	40	42	55	37	37	37	42	48	35	40	43	37	42
	(2)	35	53	36	31	36	36	34	35	47	33	40	34	36
	(3)	25	5	9	32	27	27	24	17	18	27	17	29	22
ATGSB	(1)	14	13	18	14	15	17	13	15	9	16	12	16	14
	(2)	15	20	20	11	16	15	14	14	21	13	19	14	16
	(3)	71	67	62	75	69	68	73	71	70	71	69	70	70

(1) = very or fairly useful (2) = irrelevant (3) = don't know

RESPONSE PERCENTAGES ... MAJOR ANALYSIS CATEGORIES (Cont'd)

		DEGREE OBJECTIVE				ACCUM. CREDIT HOURS				CURRENT CREDIT HOURS			PROGRAM LOCATION	
		M.A.	Spec.	Ph.D.	Non Degree	Blank or 0	1-9	10-30	30+	Blank or 0	1-8	9 or more	On Campus	Off Campus
Miller Analogies Test	(1)	13	30	26	15	14	12	15	21	20	14	17	15	14
	(2)	20	32	38	16	18	24	18	27	15	18	29	18	23
	(3)	67	38	36	69	68	64	67	52	65	68	54	67	63
Letters of reference	(1)	74	82	82	71	73	75	74	76	65	73	80	74	74
	(2)	17	16	14	14	18	13	18	17	32	16	15	14	18
	(3)	9	2	4	15	9	12	8	7	3	11	5	12	8
Personal interviews	(1)	88	96	92	84	88	86	88	93	85	87	91	85	88
	(2)	5	2	5	3	4	4	5	2	12	4	4	4	5
	(3)	7	2	3	13	8	10	7	5	3	9	5	11	7

(1) = very or fairly useful (2) = irrelevant (3) = don't know

What is your opinion about the usefulness of the English Qualifying Examination?	(1)	28	39	39	22	22	25	30	37	24	27	31	20	29
	(2)	55	35	36	50	56	56	53	44	58	53	52	61	51
	(3)	7	8	0	2	5	5	7	5	9	6	6	5	7
	(4)	10	18	25	26	17	14	10	14	9	14	11	14	13

(1) = useful (2) = not useful (3) = response not related to usefulness (4) = miscellaneous

How would you rate the general admissions standards for graduate students at Western in comparison to other schools?	(1)	14	25	21	20	17	15	13	23	7	17	13	22	13
	(2)	59	51	62	62	61	61	59	53	52	62	51	63	57
	(3)	26	22	17	17	20	23	27	23	30	20	35	14	29

(1) = higher than most or many (2) = higher than some (3) = lower than many or most

RESPONSE PERCENTAGES FOR MAJOR ANALYSIS CATEGORIES (Cont'd)

		DEGREE OBJECTIVE				ACCUM. CREDIT HOURS				CURRENT CREDIT HOURS			PROGRAM LOCATION	
		M.A.	Spec.	Ph.D.	Non Degree	Blank or 0	1-9	10-30	30+	Blank or 0	1-8	9 or more	On Campus	Off Campus
How would you change the general admissions requirements for grad students at Western?	(1)	30	33	34	25	26	25	32	35	50	25	41	18	32
	(2)	62	58	60	58	64	63	61	56	40	64	54	71	60
	(3)	8	9	6	17	10	12	7	9	10	11	5	11	8

(1) = raise them substantially or somewhat

(2) = leave them as they are

(3) = lower them somewhat or substantially

SECTION 7. Decisions to Specialize

Since starting your program of study within a major field, have you ever changed specialties (curriculum or area of concentration)?	(Yes)	9	6	14	8	5	7	10	13	14	10	7	8	9
	(No)	91	94	86	92	95	93	90	87	86	90	93	92	91

SECTION 8. Future Plans

Do you plan to continue your education with further, advanced degree work?	(Yes)	51	79	34	47	48	47	54	55	56	48	57	47	52
	(No)	45	15	66	47	46	50	43	42	41	47	42	48	45
If yes, please indicate the level of the degree program you plan to pursue.														
Specialists' program		24	25	3	32	17	28	24	24	15	29	13	37	18
Doctoral program		43	69	50	24	40	40	43	52	30	38	58	28	50
Postgraduate fellowship		1	0	13	2	1	0	1	3	0	2	0	1	1
Another master's degree		23	4	0	14	25	21	21	12	20	19	21	24	21
Other		9	2	33	28	17	11	11	9	35	12	8	10	10

RESPONSE PERCENTAGES FOR MAJOR ANALYSIS CATEGORIES (Cont'd)

	DEGREE OBJECTIVE				ACCUM. CREDIT HOURS				CURRENT CREDIT HOURS			PROGRAM LOCATION	
	M.A.	Spec.	Ph.D.	Non Degree	Blank or 0	1-9	10-30	30+	Blank or 0	1-8	9 or more	On Campus	Off Campus
If yes, do you plan to attend:													
Western Michigan University	28	38	32	41	24	29	29	43	16	38	14	44	22
Another institution, but not in Michigan	11	11	14	11	11	9	13	10	11	8	20	4	15
Another institution in Michigan	8	7	0	12	12	6	8	7	10	7	9	8	9
Don't know yet	52	44	54	36	53	56	49	40	63	47	57	44	54
If you are currently employed, are you likely to (Yes)	49	51	66	28	48	46	46	51	43	44	65	36	56
change jobs after re- (No) ceiving your degree?	51	49	34	72	52	54	54	49	57	56	35	64	44

SECTION 9. Capstone Experiences

If you are conducting research for your thesis or dissertation, how much supervision do you receive from your advisor, and how much supervision would you prefer?

Supervision given													
very close and continuous	21	25	45	17	43	15	21	39	33	21	31	0	26
close, but not continuous	19	25	19	17	0	27	15	26	0	23	16	14	20
continuous, but not very close	22	8	13	0	0	15	23	14	33	21	15	0	21
neither very close nor continuous	18	42	19	33	29	15	22	21	33	19	22	43	21
very little--considered it minimal	20	0	3	33	28	27	19	0	1	16	16	43	12

RESPONSE PERCENTAGES FOR MAJOR ANALYSIS CATEGORIES (Cont'd)

		DEGREE OBJECTIVE				ACCUM. CREDIT HOURS				CURRENT CREDIT HOURS			PROGRAM LOCATION	
		M.A.	Spec.	Ph.D.	Non Degree	Blank or 0	1-9	10-30	30+	Blank or 0	1-8	9 or more	On Campus	Off Campus
Supervision preferred														
very close and continuous		34	25	50	67	43	23	40	42	33	32	43	13	36
close, but not continuous		30	25	33	33	0	46	26	35	0	35	27	37	29
continuous, but not very close		26	33	13	0	43	23	26	16	67	23	22	25	27
neither very close nor continuous		6	17	3	0	14	4	6	5	0	7	5	25	6
very little--considered it minimal		4	0	0	0	0	4	2	2	0	3	3	0	2
If you have been or are presently on an internship, please indicate your satisfaction with this type of experience:														
Relevancy to my preparation	(1)	90	92	100	100	100	100	89	95	100	100	90	100	90
	(2)	10	8	0	0	0	0	11	5	0	0	10	0	10
Duration of internship	(1)	86	83	95	100	100	88	86	90	100	100	83	100	83
	(2)	14	17	5	0	0	12	14	10	0	0	17	0	17
Advanced planning	(1)	71	67	82	100	100	63	71	78	100	81	71	67	67
	(2)	29	33	18	0	0	37	29	22	0	19	29	33	33
Experience gained	(1)	92	100	100	100	100	88	94	98	100	100	93	100	93
	(2)	8	0	0	0	0	12	6	2	0	0	7	0	7
Degree of supervision	(1)	78	92	86	100	100	100	77	83	100	85	81	100	76
	(2)	22	8	14	0	0	0	23	17	0	15	19	0	24

(1) = very or fairly satisfactory

(2) = somewhat or very unsatisfactory

RESPONSE PERCENTAGES FOR MAJOR ANALYSIS CATEGORIES (Cont'd)

	DEGREE OBJECTIVE				ACCUM. CREDIT HOURS				CURRENT CREDIT HOURS			PROGRAM LOCATION	
	M.A.	Spec.	Ph.D.	Non Degree	Blank or 0	1-9	10-30	30+	Blank or 0	1-8	9 or more	On Campus	Off Campus
SECTION 10. Overall Evaluation													
Everything considered, how do you think graduate education at Western compares with other schools?													
the best	2	9	4	3	2	2	2	6	8	2	2	3	1
better than most	27	25	31	36	27	26	27	35	12	28	28	36	24
better than some	63	45	59	55	64	63	60	54	65	62	58	55	64
poorer than many	7	15	6	3	5	6	9	5	11	6	10	4	9
one of the poorest	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1

FOR TOTAL SAMPLE ONLY

	N	%
Wisdom of having selected WMU:		
best decision	1,322	89.2
probably should have gone elsewhere	111	7.5
poor decision	40	2.7
other	9	0.6

TABLE NO. 3-A

SECTION 5, ITEM 12: Opinion of English Qualifying Exam

1. Negative reaction: insult, way to make money, empty or unnecessary requirement, irrelevant, ridiculous, not useful, invalid, doesn't show or prove anything, not practical, shouldn't be required, should be abolished/eliminated, silly, a joke, B.S., not applicable to my field, poor, waste of time and money, serves no purpose, stupid, badly constructed. (714) 50.2%

2. Favorable reaction: quite useful, very good, valid measure, seems reasonable, a good thing, very important (necessity to be able to write), don't object, should be continued, necessary, provides control over language proficiency, useful for screening. (357) 25.1%

3. No opinion, don't know: never took it, not familiar with it, not required. (149) 10.5%

4. Reaction, not necessarily implying usefulness: didn't enjoy it, a hassle, interesting how many fail it, too easy, could be harder, won't affect use of language, standards not high if 60% needed to pass, other colleges don't require it, long and hard, reflects earlier schooling inadequacies, a snap, too much emphasis--not that important. (84) 5.9%

5. Limited usefulness: use should depend on field of endeavor, useful for foreign students who aren't fluent in English, only useful for diagnostic identification of those needing remedial work, a rough screening device only, only gives aptitude in English. (43) 3.0%

6. Alternatives suggested: mandatory course more useful, would rather write a report or paper, should be used along with other screening devices. (41) 2.9%

7. Questionable uncertainty: undecided, questionable, not sure of purpose, prove validity, dubious. (32) 2.2%

8. Miscellaneous: separates inept from fumbling. (3) 0.2%

TABLE NO. 3-B

SECTION 6, ITEMS 15-16: Field Shifts

From		To
Applied Sciences	-	Business (3)
Applied Sciences	-	Education (2)
Applied Sciences	-	Science (1)
Business	-	Education (6)
Business	-	Science (2)
Business	-	Librarianship (1)
Education	-	Librarianship (6)
Education	-	Humanities (5)
Education	-	Science (4)
Education	-	Social Science (4)
Education	-	Business (3)
Education	-	Fine Arts (1)
Fine Arts	-	Education (1)
Humanities	-	Education (16)
Humanities	-	Librarianship (5)
Humanities	-	Science (3)
Humanities	-	Social Science (2)
Humanities	-	Humanities (1)
Librarianship	-	Education (2)
Librarianship	-	Humanities (2)
Science	-	Education (19)
Science	-	Science (3)
Science	-	Applied Sciences (2)
Science	-	Social Science (2)
Social Science	-	Education (23)
Social Science	-	Social Science (4)
Social Science	-	Applied Sciences (3)
Social Science	-	Librarianship (1)

SUMMARY BY COLLEGE

College	Out	In	Net Change
Applied Sciences	4	4	0
Arts & Sciences			
Humanities	25	7	-18
Science	25	13	-12
Social Science	31	11	-20
Business	6	6	0
Education	24	65	+41
Fine Arts	1	1	0
Librarianship	4	13	+9

TABLE NO. 3-C

SECTION 6, ITEMS 17-18: Reasons for Change

1. Improve employment opportunities/qualify me for some position. (22) 18.8%
2. More beneficial, needs better met, advantageous, expand knowledge. (19) 16.2%
3. Change in interests/new interest/preference. (14) 12.0%
4. Program content not relevant, core requirements not worth the effort. (7) 6.0%
5. Failure on some criterion/rejection from program, doing poorly. (6) 5.1%
6. Job change required additional or different training. (6) 5.1%
7. Curriculum/major area added or dropped, opened up, used first to get into second. (6) 5.1%
8. To avoid thesis, oral or written exams. (5) 4.3%
9. Narrow scope, too specialized--wanted broader knowledge. (5) 4.3%
10. Course offerings limited, poor availability of. (4) 3.4%
11. Disliked program requirement of full-time study, field work, etc. (4) 3.4%
12. Department not liked (too easy, inadequate, etc.). (3) 2.6%
13. Miscellaneous: "personal", interests rewarded but not encouraged by former department. (3) 2.6%
14. Didn't like what I was doing. (2) 1.7%
15. Didn't like courses. (2) 1.7%
16. Didn't like faculty for some reason. (2) 1.7%
17. Advising received was poor or misleading. (2) 1.7%
18. Too crowded. (2) 1.7%
19. To meet professional requirements. (1) 0.9%
20. Greater flexibility in designing own program. (1) 0.9%
21. Financial: to get assistantship. (1) 0.8%

SECTION 6, ITEMS 19-20: Accumulated Credit Hours Before Change

3 to 6 hours - 33	37 to 60 hours - 6
7 to 12 hours - 18	BA/BS - 3
13 to 24 hours - 16	MA/MS - 7
25 to 36 hours - 11	

TABLE NO. 3-D

SECTION 7, ITEM 28: "Other" Reasons for Specialization

1. Directly related to my present job (relevant to; already in job in this area; will improve my job knowledge/skills; make me more effective in my job); needed for certification. (83) 24.2%

2. This is what I am interested in; challenging/exciting. (63) 18.4%

3. I like/love area--this is what I want to do, enjoyable; fulfilling and rewarding, satisfying/preference. (49) 14.3%

4. Area appropriate in terms of goals, experience, background, and past education (employment not specifically mentioned). (40) 11.7%

5. Other/miscellaneous responses. (35) 10.2%

6. Qualifies me for different/better position (more flexible and broader with respect to employment possibilities; advancement; better opportunities--qualify for professional school). (25) 7.3%

7. Where I can be of service/make a contribution to society/humanity. (18) 5.2%

8. Meets critical need for people trained in this area, an important area or field; demand for people. (15) 4.4%

9. Enhance employment opportunities/permit employment where not otherwise possible. (8) 2.3%

10. Financial/assistantship incentives to go into this area. (7) 2.0%

TABLE NO. 3-E

SECTION 7, ITEM 30: Reasons for Changing Specialty Within a Major Field

1. More relevant to interests or goals (a change in interests or goals). (32) 23.4%
2. Improve financial/employment opportunities. (26) 19.0%
3. More relevant and useful in present job. (15) 10.9%
4. Expediency/practicality: reduce time/costs, get assistantship, loss of credits. (12) 8.8%
5. Problems associated with former academic program. (12) 8.8%
6. Positive aspects connected with new academic program. (11) 8.0%
7. Other/miscellaneous. (11) 8.0%
8. More relevant to my needs, background, and experience. (8) 5.8%
9. Change consequence of job-related change. (6) 4.4%
10. Change related to reevaluation of personal characteristics (skill, talents, etc.). (4) 2.9%

TABLE NO. 3-F

SECTION 8, ITEMS 34-35: Vocational Goals

1. Teaching (and coaching/research) - university or college level. (146) 12.1%
2. Administration - educational. (116) 9.6%
3. Teaching (and coaching) - primary, secondary, and unspecified. (93) 7.7%
4. Counseling/counselor. (89) 7.4%
5. Become more effective teacher. (72) 6.0%
6. Continue in teaching (earn permanent certification). (58) 4.8%
7. Teaching (and coaching) - junior/community college. (52) 4.3%
8. Miscellaneous: personal satisfaction, to fully integrate theoretical insights and practical skills and apply them to social problems, to reach and influence human beings for better adjustments in life, continue education, Ph.D., M.A. (49) 4.1%
9. Managerial, supervisory, and executive positions in industry. (48) 4.0%
10. Psychologist, psychiatrist. (47) 3.9%
11. Allied health professions (dentistry, medicine, occupational therapy, speech pathology and audiology, nutritionist). (34) 2.8%
12. Library (other than school) - staff/technical. (34) 2.8%
13. Consultant. (33) 2.7%
14. Teaching (miscellaneous) - private school, of handicapped, of blind, developmental school, etc. (29) 2.4%
15. Research. (26) 2.2%
16. Undecided. (26) 2.2%
17. Social service work (correctional treatment, juvenile care, rehabilitation, work with disadvantaged, mental health clinic--not psychologist, drug abuse, etc.). (23) 1.9%
18. Library (school) - staff/technical. (22) 1.8%
19. Accounting, C.P.A., auditor, comptroller, statistician, investment advisor, banking. (16) 1.3%
20. Become more effective in non-teaching jobs. (15) 1.3%
21. Directorship - educational setting. (15) 1.3%
22. Social work - practice. (15) 1.3%
23. Governmental service, all forms including foreign service. (13) 1.1%
24. Media/A-V specialist. (12) 1.0%
25. Law, legal services, lawyer. (11) 0.9%
26. Staff position in business (personnel, public relations, etc.). (11) 0.9%
27. Social work - administration. (11) 0.9%
28. Artistic (performing arts, interior decorating, journalist, etc.). (10) 0.8%
29. Continue in non-teaching jobs. (9) 0.8%
30. Administration - non-education. (8) 0.7%
31. Directorship - social service agency. (8) 0.7%
32. Operator of an enterprise (being owner/manager not specified). (8) 0.7%
33. Urban/regional planner, environmental consultant. (9) 0.7%
34. Library (other than school) - administrative position. (7) 0.6%
35. Media and library work combined. (6) 0.5%
36. Deanship. (5) 0.4%
37. Physical sciences: field biologist, geologist, chemist-technician in industry. (5) 0.4%
38. Directorship - other than education or social service agency. (4) 0.3%
39. Pastor, minister, industrial chaplain, Christian camp work. (4) 0.3%
40. Engineering. (2) 0.2%
41. Library (school) - administrative position. (1) 0.1%
42. Transportation profession: pilot. (1) 0.1%

TABLE NO. 3-G

SECTION 8, ITEM 37: Nature of Vocational Changes

1. Teaching to non-teaching position within education. (105) 21.4%

2. Change in level (high school to college, junior college to university, be in complete charge of program, principal to superintendent) - function apparently the same in educational career field. (75) 15.3%

3. Career field change, non-educational (or non-specified). (74) 15.1%

4. Lateral move (to better location, more innovative organization, larger company, private to public school, from teaching to teaching of reading). (58) 11.8%

5. Improvement/elevation within career field, non-educational. (52) 10.6%

6. Miscellaneous and other: seeking valid employment experience, dependent on job situation at graduation, because I'm moving, won't have graduate assistantship, on leave, etc. (47) 9.6%

7. Other career field to education. (37) 7.6%

8. Within career field/same general function: part-time, temporary to full-time, regular status. (18) 3.7%

9. Education to other career field. (15) 3.1%

0. Non-teaching position in education to teaching. (9) 1.8%

TABLE NO. 3-H

SECTION 9, ITEM 45: Foreign Students' Problems

1. No problems, specified. (11) 25%
2. Bias or prejudice against foreigners (discrimination). (8) 18.2%
3. Language and communication problems - understanding language. (7) 15.9%
4. Cost, lack of financial assistance. (5) 11.4%
5. Employment opportunities limited or unavailable. (3) 6.8%
6. Academic: unfamiliar with program, teaching system; relating to faculty informally; competitive, individualistic situation in department. (3) 6.8%
7. Housing/dorms - some inadequacies (including food). (2) 4.6%
8. Uncomfortable about and lack of knowledge concerning customs/culture. (2) 4.5%
9. No comment, specified. (2) 4.5%
10. Insufficient interaction with other foreign students. (1) 2.3%

TABLE NO. 3-I

SECTION 10, ITEM 46: Reasons for Attending WMU

1. Location and convenience: already living in Kalamazoo, close to home, employer near Kalamazoo, close enough to commute. (721) 48.2%

2. Attracted by highly specific feature: fellowship, like Kalamazoo, gain background in behaviorism, opportunity for performing, specific faculty member there with whom I can work, specific type of internship available interest in specific course, has only program in nation, etc. (198) 13.2%

3. Quality of school, program/department and faculty: liked faculty, liked school, considered one of the better schools, good educational program, good department, fine program in my field, good reputation, program adequate for my needs, program offered I want, like staff in my area, like departmental orientation, school has accreditation, good instruction in my field. (197) 13.1%

4. Bachelor's degree from WMU, know/familiar with school, graduated from Western, husband chose WMU for his degree. (161) 10.7%

5. Availability of courses/classes through extension and Continuing Education, at night, in evenings, on Saturdays, and in spring/summer terms or more general availability. (72) 4.8%

6. Advised or counseled to attend WMU, WMU recommended by someone, required to attend by sponsor (foreign students only). (51) 3.4%

7. Was accepted WMU, got into a program--was admitted, grades not good enough to go elsewhere, didn't require GRE, didn't require thesis, program had openings, thought I could get in. (43) 2.9%

8. Resource requirements: the cost, requires less time/the time required, number of credit hours needed, the in-state tuition, lower cost of living. (36) 2.4%

9. Miscellaneous: sensitive to needs of Chicano students, etc. (17) 1.1%

10. General characteristics of school: liked friendly atmosphere and students, size of school, enjoyable surroundings. (3) 0.2%

TABLE NO. 3-J

SECTION 10, ITEMS 48-49: WMU Poor Choice Reasons

Academic Programs

1. Program/department/course/class weak, of poor quality, inadequate, not of great benefit, extension of undergraduate level. (34) 20.7%
2. Program content/emphasis inappropriate for my needs and objectives, degree in my area not really offered. (24) 14.6%
3. Selection/variety and choice of courses restricted and limited. (7) 4.3%
4. Desired courses/classes not offered or rarely so. (5) 3.1%
5. Little or no opportunity for self-determination, independent thinking, not receptive to progressive or unique, etc. (4) 2.5%
6. Overall educational quality of school is low. (3) 1.8%
7. Scheduling of classes not optimal, including not allowing part-time study. (3) 1.8%
8. Inadequate advising of students. (3) 1.8%
9. The English Qualifying Exam. (2) 1.2%
10. Disparity between course descriptions and actual content. (2) 1.2%
11. Strict program requirements; inflexibility. (2) 1.2%
12. Large classes. (2) 1.2%
13. Lack of structure. (1) 0.6%
14. Department admissions standards. (1) 0.6%
15. Too many credit hours required. (1) 0.6%

Academic Support Facilities

1. Research facilities. (3) 1.8%
2. Clinic/internship/practical experience limited or lacking. (1) 0.6%

Faculty

1. Poor quality (also disorganized, non-professional). (10) 6.1%
2. Negative attitudes toward students. (4) 2.5%
3. Lack of cohesion - factionalized. (4) 2.5%
4. Fields of interest narrow. (3) 1.8%
5. Impersonal - lack of opportunity for contacts. (2) 1.2%
6. Insufficient in number. (1) 0.6%

Students

1. Attitudes. (2) 1.2%
2. Low calibre. (2) 1.2%
3. Too many in program. (1) 0.6%

SECTION 10, ITEMS 48-49: WMU Poor Choice Reasons
(Cont'd)

The University

1. Reputation not high; not well known. (6) 3.7%
2. Don't like or dissatisfied with the university generally. (3) 1.8%
3. Lack of cooperation/help from offices. (2) 1.2%
4. Administrative procedures, rules and requirements. (1) 0.6%

Other Universities

1. Best to do graduate work at school other than one where Bachelors was obtained. (4) 2.5%
2. Another school provides wider scope of ideas, opinions, experiences. (2) 1.2%
3. Value a degree from University of Michigan more highly. (1) 0.6%
4. All advanced work should not be taken at one school. (1) 0.6%

Other (Miscellaneous)

1. Couldn't afford to go elsewhere, costs kept me here. (2) 1.2%
2. Little or no financial aid, few assistantships. (2) 1.2%
3. Doesn't enhance chances of getting into doctoral program. (2) 1.2%
4. Prospects for employment better elsewhere. (1) 0.6%
5. Environment. (1) 0.6%
6. Not beneficial in getting a job. (1) 0.6%
7. Need a change. (1) 0.6%
8. Turned down for degree program, couldn't get degree. (1) 0.6%
9. Hurt chances of changing to another field. (1) 0.6%
10. My interests changed. (1) 0.6%
11. Probably could have made it in a tougher school. (1) 0.6%
12. Take more time here than elsewhere. (1) 0.6%

Irrelevant

1. "Something is missing, as of now, I am trying to find out what."
   My degree program is from Michigan State University.
   I am just taking a few courses here to transfer over to MSU.
   (2) 1.2%

TABLE NO. 3-K

SECTION 10, ITEMS 51-52: Best Feature of Program

1. Faculty--quality and characteristics of one, several, or all. (230) 17.3%
2. Flexibility of program in meeting educational needs; freedom of choice in selecting courses and structuring of curricula and program contents. (162) 12.2%
3. Close relationship/interaction with faculty members. (148) 11.1%
4. Opportunity for structured, supervised experiences and facilities such as practicum, internship, lessons, field experience, reading clinic, applied work. (109) 8.2%
5. Practical, utilitarian nature of the program and courses of my education generally. (37) 2.8%
6. Attributes of program of study: core, content, broad exposure, inter-disciplinary approach. (78) 5.9%
7. Personal and professional growth/development--increased knowledge and skills. (69) 5.2%
8. No comment, can't say, don't know. (60) 4.5%
9. Availability of courses off-campus through extension (Continuing Education). (54) 4.1%
10. Convenience and availability of courses/programs: offerings at night/ in evenings, Saturdays, spring/summer terms; part-time students can continue and earn degree. (39) 2.9%
11. Practical, utilitarian nature of the program and courses of my education generally. (37) 2.8%
12. Helpful advising; good counseling by advisors, relationship with advisor. (37) 2.8%
13. Contacts and interaction with others; the people I've met. (29) 2.2%
14. Miscellaneous. (28) 2.1%
15. My department. (25) 1.9%
16. Diversity and variety of programs, curricula, courses, etc. (23) 1.7%
17. Ease of: program, not hard, no thesis required, no pressure for grades, adequate time to complete degree, registration. (22) 1.7%
18. Research facilities and opportunities. (21) 1.6%
19. Individualized. (18) 1.4%
20. Elective courses. (11) 0.8%
21. Location. (10) 0.8%
22. Academically rigorous; little busy work. (6) 0.4%
23. Will qualify me for a job (certification, accredited school included here). (6) 0.4%
24. Adequate. (5) 0.4%
25. Friendly, helpful attitudes and atmosphere. (3) 0.2%
26. Meets my needs adequately. (2) 0.1%
27. Reputation of school. (1) 0.1%

TABLE NO. 3-L

SECTION 10, ITEMS 53-54: Least Desirable Feature of Program

1. Courses in major field: required, core courses. (167) 12.8%
2. Faculty: incompetence, lack of expertise, no time for students, poor, boring lectures, etc. (123) 9.4%
3. Availability of courses: selection limited, courses in catalog not really offered, courses not offered through extension, etc. (103) 7.9%
4. Miscellaneous: commuting, loss of credits, classes with undergraduates, MA less important, employment postponed, etc. (97) 7.5%
5. Courses, general/unspecified: too much busy work, repetitive, simplified, little individualization, irrelevant content, etc. (93) 7.2%
6. Scheduling of courses inconvenient: sequence not in order, offered only in daytime, offered only in evenings, not offered on Saturdays, offered only in or not in spring/summer, lack of long-range schedule, part-time/working student can't get courses, etc. (80) 6.1%
7. Flexibility lacking: no freedom of choice to select courses or plan program, restriction on hours outside major, etc. (67) 5.1%
8. Educational goals/objectives not being met by program/curriculum: education not practical, too theoretical, talk but don't do, no work experience provided, etc. (66) 5.1%
9. Nothing undesirable, specified. (56) 4.3%
10. Counseling and advising: poor, inadequate, lacking, misleading. (48) 3.7%
11. Evaluation methods: exams, comprehensives, grades and emphasis on grades, maintaining 3.0 GPA, etc. (40) 3.1%
12. Residency requirements. (37) 2.8%
13. Size: classes too large, enrollment too large or small, getting too big, etc. (37) 2.8%
14. Don't know: can't say, no comment. (34) 2.6%
15. Cost: tuition, fees, lack of funds, size of stipend, etc. (31) 2.4%
16. Screening methods: English Qualifying Exam, ATGSB, irrelevant screening techniques, etc. (26) 2.0%
17. Resource inadequacies: library, research facilities, materials, limited off-campus resources, etc. (25) 1.9%
18. Requirements, general: meeting them, red tape, prerequisites, etc. (20) 1.5%
19. Unstructured: desired behaviors not specified, not knowing what's expected, too flexible or loose, etc. (19) 1.5%
20. Lack of interaction/social contacts. (19) 1.5%
21. Type of work required: term paper, research, research projects, thesis, etc. (18) 1.4%
22. Time required: length, number of hours needed for degree, etc. (14) 1.1%
23. Graduate College: lack of assistance, staff, etc. (14) 1.1%
24. Courses, optional/electives, cognates, etc. (12) 0.9%
25. Scholarship lacking: no academic atmosphere, lack of emphasis on scholarly pursuits, etc. (10) 0.8%
26. Statute of limitations: not necessary, why have it?, etc. (9) 0.7%
27. Work load: writing many papers, work required for a 2 hr. course, etc. (9) 0.7%
28. Field education/practical experience/internship: lacking, planned poorly, not relevant, etc. (8) 0.6%
29. General university orientation/emphasis inappropriate for me. (8) 0.6%
30. Departmental: poor organization, poor administration, political conflict of interests (attaining national recognition), narrowness of Psychology Department, etc. (6) 0.5%
31. Fellow students' attitudes, scholarship, etc. (4) 0.3%
32. Cost and time required in combination: no return on investment of money and time. (1) 0.1%

APPENDIX A

Survey Materials

WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

THE GRADUATE COLLEGE PHONE (616) 383-1660 KALAMAZOO, MICHIGAN 49001

March 9, 1973

The Graduate Office is now preparing for a comprehensive study of graduate education at Western Michigan University by the Office of Institutional Research in 1973-74. If this study is to generate recommendations that will improve graduate education at this University, it must have input from a representative sampling of our graduate students. You have been selected as one of those from whom we would like to receive information. This letter is to acquaint you with the purpose of this survey and to urge your participation.

You may expect to receive a questionnaire from the Office of Institutional Research within a few days. Although it is comprehensive, pilot testing indicates that the time required to respond to it is not inordinate.

I want to emphasize the fact that the information we need in this phase of the study can only be obtained from you. Thus, without your participation the study will lack validity. I want to thank you in advance for any courtesy you extend in responding to the questionnaire and returning it.

Sincerely,

George G. Mallinson

George G. Mallinson, Dean

GGM/lkf

WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

KALAMAZOO, MICHIGAN
49001

March 12, 1973

Dear Graduate Student:

Recently a letter was sent from The Graduate College alerting you to the fact that you had been selected to participate in a survey to be conducted by this office. We are now requesting your assistance in the completion of what we believe to be an important project. We are interested in your reactions and opinions concerning a diverse number of factors relating to your life as a graduate student here at Western Michigan University. Student inputs are one source which can be used to improve the quality of graduate education.

Enclosed is a questionnaire which represents an attempt to systematically gather information about the attitudes of our graduate students. We are contacting every other graduate student who is enrolled this Winter semester. We are asking for your name only so that a follow-up may be made for those persons not responding to this initial request. Names will not be associated in any way with the analysis of data; the results will be reported on a group basis only. This office assures confidentiality.

We have enclosed a self-addressed envelope requiring no postage for your convenience in returning the completed questionnaire. Should you choose to assist us, may I take the opportunity to thank you for your participation in this study.

Sincerely yours,

John E. Nangle

John E. Nangle
Assistant Director

REMINDER

Dear Graduate Student:

Recently our office sent some materials to you in conjunction with our study of opinions concerning graduate education at Western. We hope you will help us in this project, if you haven't already, by completing the questionnaire and returning it in the self-addressed envelope provided. Thank you.

Sincerely,

John E. Nangle

John E. Nangle
Assistant Director
Office of Institutional Research
Western Michigan University

55

WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

KALAMAZOO, MICHIGAN
49001

April 12, 1973

Dear Graduate Student:

Approximately four weeks ago, we sent to your local or home address a cover letter, questionnaire and return envelope as part of our study to collect student attitudes about graduate education at Western. We also sent you a reminder in the form of a postal card about two weeks ago.

If you haven't already done so, we would like to encourage your participation in this project. In the possibility that the first mailing of the questionnaire did not reach you or was misplaced, we are enclosing another copy of the questionnaire along with a return, self-addressed envelope requiring no postage for your use.

I would like to stress that we place a great deal of importance on the value of graduate student feedback as a significant means of informing ourselves about the present status and quality of graduate education. This is the first project of its kind, both in terms of objectives and magnitude, and your involvement is needed for its success.

The results will be released in a way that protects the identity of individual respondents. The completed questionnaires are kept in this office. We hope you will decide to help.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

John E. Nangle

John E. Nangle
Assistant Director

JEN/sg
Encls.

WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY
Office of Institutional Research

GRADUATE STUDENT SURVEY

Name (print) _____
Last First Middle Initial

SECTION 1. Background Information. So that results can be analyzed in terms of important student characteristics, please complete the following background items.

6. Sex: ____ Male ____ Female 7-8. Age: ____ 9. Marital Status: ____ Single ____ Married ____ Other ____

10. Race (optional): _____ 11. Degree you are working towards? _____

12. Employed? ____Yes ____ No. 13. If yes, do you hold an assistantship? ____ Yes ____ No

14. Do you hold a Fellowship? ____ Yes ____No. 15. Residency: ____ Michigan ____ Other

16. Are you presently taking your course work through the Division of Continuing Education? ____ Yes ____ No. How many credit hours have you earned off-campus? _____

17-18. What is your present field (curriculum or major area)? _____

19. Previous Degree(s) _____

SECTION 2. Satisfaction With Academic Program. The following represent specific aspects of a graduate student's academic program. We would like your opinion about these features in terms of the extent of your satisfaction with them. Place a check mark in the appropriate column for each item.

	Very Satisfied 1	Fairly Satisfied 2	Not Espec. Satisfied 3	Very Dissatisfied 4	Doesn't Pertain to me 5
20. The advising I receive about my academic program					
21. The frequency with which courses I need are offered					
22. The overall content of my program					
23. The "core" requirements in my program					
24. The sequence of courses in my program					
25. The instructional faculty					
26. Grading procedures, policies, and practices					
27. The length of my program in credit hours					
28. The flexibility I have in planning my own program of study					
29. The opportunity to formally evaluate the courses I take					
30. The tuition rate					
31. The size of the stipend (pay) for an assistantship					
32. The amount of work I am required to perform in the assistantship					
33. Availability of an assistantship					
34. Relevancy of assistantship to my professional preparation					

35. Based upon your experience thus far, how would you rate your department's faculty with respect to the following?

	Excellent 1	Fair 2	Poor 3
36. Knowledge of their field			
37. Teaching ability			
38. Productivity (Publishing, creative works, etc.)			
39. Research skills			
40. Helpfulness to students			

How much encouragement have you received from faculty members to attend professional meetings or to present papers, perform, exhibit, etc.? (Circle one in each column.)

41. To attend professional meetings		42. To present papers, perform, exhibit, etc.
1	Great deal of encouragement	1
2	Moderate amount of encouragement	2
3	Small amount of encouragement	3
4	No encouragement	4
5	Doesn't pertain to me	5

57

From the list below, please check on the left one area that most nearly represents the kind of preparation you are seeking. Then, on the right, indicate the extent to which you believe your program provides opportunities for that type of professional preparation.

		Opportunities for Preparation			
		Excellent 1	Good 2	Fair 3	Poor 4
43. ____	Teaching only	44. ____	____	____	____
45. ____	Research only	46. ____	____	____	____
47. ____	Teaching and Research	48. ____	____	____	____
49. ____	Applications (administration, etc.)	50. ____	____	____	____

SECTION 3. Adequacy of Facilities and Services. There are other aspects to graduate education at Western which more or less affect all graduate students. Please indicate your opinion of these by checking the appropriate blanks below:

	Very Adequate 1	Fairly Adequate 2	Not Adequate 3	Doesn't pertain to me or don't know 4
51. Cooperation and assistance of The Graduate College Office	____	____	____	____
52. Availability of courses in the Spring and Summer terms	____	____	____	____
53. Availability of courses I need in the evenings or on Saturday	____	____	____	____
54. Opportunity to complete some portion of my graduate program through off-campus courses	____	____	____	____
55. Availability of useful job information in my field from the Career Planning and Placement Center	____	____	____	____
56. My department as a source of useful job information	____	____	____	____
57. Availability of off-campus housing facilities	____	____	____	____
58. Access to study facilities (quiet study space such as carrels)	____	____	____	____
59. Availability to typing services when needed	____	____	____	____
60. Availability of duplication services when needed	____	____	____	____
61. Literature and reference resources (e.g., Waldo Library, ERC, Business Library, etc.)	____	____	____	____
Availability of research facilities:				
62. Laboratory space	____	____	____	____
63. Specialized equipment	____	____	____	____
64. Computer/EDP capabilities	____	____	____	____
65. Special settings in which research can be conducted	____	____	____	____
66. The orientation of new graduate students to the University and their departments.	____	____	____	____

Financial Aid. While numerous other sources may provide funds needed by graduate students, one possible source is a University loan of some type. What has been your experience?

67. Have you ever applied for a loan through the University? ____ Yes ____ No

68. If yes, was it approved? ____ Yes ____ No

69. Please indicate the type of loan by checking one of the following:

____ National Defense Student Loan ____ Guaranteed Student Loan
____ Short-term loan ____ College Aid Plan
____ Tuition Payment Plan ____ Don't know
____ Other (describe: ____)

70. In applying for a loan, how easy was it to secure one?

____ Very easy ____ Fairly difficult
____ Fairly easy ____ Very difficult

71. Please describe the extent to which a loan met your financial needs:

____ Very adequately ____ Not too adequately
____ Fairly adequately ____ Not at all adequately

SECTION 4. Participation. For the following, indicate both the degree to which you believe opportunities have been available and the changes you would like to see in them by placing the appropriate number in the blanks.

	Present Opportunity (1=Great, 2=Some, 3=Little, 4=None)	Would like to see (1=Much more, 2=Some more, 3=A little more, 4=No change)
72. Graduate student participation in departmental governance	____	____
73. Graduate student participation in some aspects of governance at the University level	____	____
74. Participation in social activities for graduate students	____	____
75. Participation in athletic or other recreational activities	____	____
76. Informal contacts with the faculty members in my department	____	____

	Present Opportunity (1=Great, 2=Some, 3=Little, 4=None)	Would like to see (1=Much more, 2=Some more, 3=A little more, 4=No change)
77. Discussions about my career plans with faculty members	.....	.....
78. Chances to hear and meet guest lecturers or visitors who are prominent in my field	.....	.....

SECTION 5. Admissions and Assessment.

What is your opinion about the usefulness of each of the following in screening applicants?	Very Useful 1	Fairly Useful 2	Irrelevant; other data more useful 3	Don't Know 4
6. Undergraduate grades	.....	.....	.....	.....
7. Graduate Record Exam (aptitude portion)	.....	.....	.....	.....
8. ATGSB	.....	.....	.....	.....
9. Miller Analogies Test	.....	.....	.....	.....
10. Letters of reference	.....	.....	.....	.....
11. Personal interviews	.....	.....	.....	.....

12. What is your opinion about the usefulness of the English Qualifying Examination? .....

.....

13. How would you rate the general admissions standards for graduate students at Western in comparison to other schools?

..... Higher than most
..... Higher than many
..... Higher than some
..... Lower than many
..... Lower than most

14. How would you change the general admissions requirements for graduate students at Western?

..... Raise them substantially
..... Raise them somewhat
..... Leave them as they are
..... Lower them somewhat
..... Lower them substantially

SECTION 6. Program Changes. Some graduate students, after beginning their programs, change their major field from one discipline (such as Education) to another (such as Social Work). If you have made such a change, please complete the following. Otherwise, omit and go to Section 7.

15-16. What was your original major field? .....

17-18. What is your current major field? .....

19-20. Approximately how many credit hours did you accumulate before changing? ..... hours

Briefly indicate the reason(s) why you changed fields. .....

.....

21. How easy was it administratively to make such a change?

..... Very easy ..... Fairly easy ..... Not too easy ..... Very difficult

SECTION 7. Decisions to Specialize. When persons begin their graduate program in some field (such as Business, Education, or Psychology), they may also decide to specialize in the form of an area of concentration or a curriculum (for example, finance in Business, line administration in Educational Leadership, or Clinical Psychology).

☐ Check here if specialty not yet selected, omit, and go to Section 8.

From the list below please indicate the relative importance of each factor in helping you decide on an area of specialization. Place a "1" next to the most important reason, a "2" by the second most important, and "3" next to the third most important reason. Rank no more than the three most important factors. However, you may mark only 1 or 2 of them if few affected your decision.

22. ..... My aptitude and talents seem to lie in this area
23. ..... I was advised or counseled into selecting this specialty
24. ..... Offers greatest employment opportunities at present
25. ..... This was the only area open and accepting students at the time
26. ..... Appears relatively secure—shouldn't have to worry about unemployment
27. ..... Best long range income potential
28. ..... Other (please describe .....

.....)

29. Since starting your program of study within a major field, have you ever changed specialities (curriculum or area of concentration)? ..... Yes ..... No

30. If yes, briefly indicate why you made a change: .....

.....

.....

SECTION 8. Future Plans. The following questions are designed to provide some idea about your personal plans upon graduation.

31. Do you plan to continue your education with further, advanced degree work? ..... Yes ..... No

32. If yes, please indicate the level of the degree program you plan to pursue.

..... Specialists' program	..... Doctoral program
..... Postgraduate fellowship	..... Another master's degree
..... Other (Describe .....)	

33. If yes, do you plan to attend (check one):

..... Western Michigan University	..... Another institution in Michigan
..... Another institution, but not in Michigan	..... Don't know yet

34-35. Please describe briefly your vocational goal: .....

36. If you are currently employed, are you likely to change jobs after receiving your degree? ..... Yes ..... No

37. If yes, please indicate the nature of the vocational change that's likely to occur: .....

SECTION 9. If these questions do not refer to you, please go on to Section 10.
If you are conducting research for your thesis or dissertation, how much supervision do you receive from your thesis advisor, and how much supervision would you prefer? (Circle one in each column.)

38. Supervision Given		39. Supervision Preferred
1	Very close and continuous	1
2	Close, but not continuous	2
3	Continuous, but not very close	3
4	Neither very close nor continuous	4
5	Very little—considered it minimal	5

If you have been or are presently on an internship, please indicate your satisfaction with this type of experience:

	Very Satisfactory 1	Fairly Satisfactory 2	Somewhat Unsatisfactory 3	Very Unsatisfactory 4
40. Relevancy to my preparation	.....	.....	.....	.....
41. Duration of internship	.....	.....	.....	.....
42. Advanced planning	.....	.....	.....	.....
43. Experience gained	.....	.....	.....	.....
44. Degree of Supervision	.....	.....	.....	.....

For foreign students: Please indicate here if you have encountered any special problems because of the fact that you are a foreign student.

45. .....

SECTION 10. Overall Evaluation.

46. Please indicate why you originally decided to attend Western's Graduate School as opposed to some other school: .....

47. Looking back, do you think you made the best decision by choosing WMU for your graduate training?

..... I definitely made the best decision by coming here.
..... I am pretty sure I made the best decision by coming here.
..... I am pretty sure I should have gone elsewhere.
..... I definitely made a poor decision in coming here.

48-49. If you have checked off either of the last two alternatives, please indicate the reason for this opinion. .....

50. Everything considered, how do you think graduate education at Western compares with other schools?

..... the best	..... poorer than many
..... better than most	..... one of the poorest
..... better than some	

51-52. Taking into account all aspects of your academic program to date, please indicate what you believe to be:
The best feature of your graduate program .....

53-54. The least desirable feature of your graduate program .....

Comments:

WE APPRECIATE YOUR HELP IN THIS PROJECT
(Please use the self-addressed, stamped envelope to return the survey.)
THANK YOU